

DISCUSSION OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-3, 6-11, 13-14 and 15-18 are active in the present application. Claims 4 and 12 are canceled claims. Claims 15-18 are new claims. Support for new Claims 15-18 is found in the examples and on pages 12-13 of the specification.

No new matter is believed to have been added by this amendment.

REMARKS

Independent Claim 1 now recites a molding composition that includes a cross-linking agent that has at least two isocyanate groups. Applicants submit that present Claim 1 is novel and not obvious in view of the art relied on by the Examiner.

The Office cites Nakamura (US 7,019,074) as evidence that the previously presented claims are obvious. Nakamura does not disclose any composition that includes a cross-linking agent having a diisocyanate group or a polyisocyanate. Applicants thus request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office rejected previously pending Claim 1 as indefinite. The Office asserts that the meaning of the claims is uncertain because the term “crosslinked” appears in the claims but one of ordinary skill in the art would not understand how a polymer such as a polybutene polymer can be crosslinked when the polymer’s functional groups are located only at the termini of the polymer chain.

Applicants submit that those of ordinary skill in the art can readily recognize and understand the terms of the present claims. Presently pending Claim 1 recites a crosslinked isobutene polymer that is made from the isobutene polymer recited in the claims. Applicants submit that those of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that the functional group-terminated polybutene polymer reacts with the crosslinking agent recited in the claims and thus forms a product and/or reacted material that is described in the specification as a crosslinked material.

Claim 1 makes it clear that the cross linking agent is one that has reacted with an isobutene polymer to form a “crosslinked isobutene polymer”. Claim 1 is therefore consistent within itself of the use the term crosslinked. Moreover, the original specification uses the term “crosslinked” in the same manner. Thus, those of ordinary skill in the art

would readily recognize the metes and bounds of the presently claimed invention. Applicants thus request withdrawal of the rejection.

On March 31, 2009, Applicants U.S. representative discussed the above-identified application with the Examiner. The Examiner acknowledged that Applicants can act as their own lexicographers as long such actions are consistent with the specification.

For reasons discussed above in detail, Applicants submit that all now-pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection and the mailing of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Stefan U. Koschmieder, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 50,238

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)